



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

either Pulsifer's, Bradford's, Winthrop's or that of the Hartford manuscript. The Plymouth patent of January 13, 1630, is wrongly dated 1629.

The foot-notes are confined within modest limits, but are not free from grave error. It is twice stated (pp. 1621, 1827) that the Virginia patent of 1606 "*gave the lands* along the North American coast between the thirty-fourth and the forty-fifth degrees of north latitude to two companies", etc. Note *c* on p. 3035 shows the editor not duly cognizant of the traits of a writ of privy seal, not patent under the great seal, in the passage above. He conceives of the act of 1790 for the government of the territory of the United States south of the Ohio as being among the organic acts of Kentucky. In the case of New Hampshire an excellent body of notes has been supplied by Mr. A. S. Batchellor.

The chief general criticism to be made upon Dr. Thorpe's foot-notes is that, whereas a proper appreciation of the scope and bearing of many of these acts and constitutions depends largely upon a knowledge of changing boundary lines and of other facts of historical geography, the information supplied on these matters is often insufficient and sometimes quite erroneous. Striking examples of this weakness may be seen if a reader having in mind the West Florida episode will examine the notes under Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. Three notes on p. 2594 belong on p. 2533.

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON.

History of the City of New York in the Seventeenth Century. By MRS. SCHUYLER VAN RENSSELAER. Volume I. *New Amsterdam*; Volume II. *New York under the Stuarts*. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1909. Pp. xxviii, 533; xii, 640.)

THE city of New York has not yet attained the literary dignity of Rome, which can show a list of several thousands of treatises upon its history, antiquities, and topography. As however Mrs. Van Rensselaer in her present work has appended a list of five hundred and fifty "Books and Articles of Value" (the latter mostly of a documentary nature), very largely used by her in the preparation of her history of the eighty-two years from Hudson's voyage in 1609 to the fall of Leisler in 1691, we may say that New York, for the period of its infancy, has made a very good start. If from this formidable list we eliminate the comparatively limited number of collections of official documents and of contemporaneous treatises of one sort or another we have remaining a long array of histories and monographs of various descriptions, some of which are good, many are indifferent or suspicious, and some are shocking. The value, therefore, of a new writer's work in this particular field must depend largely upon the judgment which he shows in accepting or in rejecting the deductions of his predecessors.

The author of the work under review has some special qualifications for her undertaking. Her untiring industry in historical research is so

manifest from the mere inspection of her volumes that it is unnecessary to enlarge upon it. With the general current of history of her chosen period she is familiar. Either by intuition or by experience she possesses an apparently just conception of the Dutch character and of its various manifestations in the affairs of ordinary life. This has enabled her as a rule to avoid the influence of what may be called the Washington Irving school of writers, which has done so much to propagate false and unworthy notions of New Netherland history. For these notions she has an undisguised and proper contempt. Furthermore, Mrs. Van Rensselaer has carefully studied one or two very recent works, such, for example, as the *Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts*, published by the state of New York, and in the previously hidden facts brought to light by these publications she has been able to find much to add to the historical matter set forth by her predecessors in her chosen field of literature.

With all these advantages, however, the author has been unable to avoid one very serious source of error; this arises from the method she has adopted in prosecuting her investigations. All historical research resolves itself ultimately in one way or another into a consideration at first or at second hand of contemporaneous original sources. The sources of New Netherland history, however, offer peculiar difficulties to investigators. Written in a language with which comparatively few have acquaintance and in a script painfully trying to the modern eye, the student is almost irresistibly led in many cases to rely upon translations of these documents which have appeared from time to time by various hands, or to the dangerous practice of resorting to the calendar entries alone for the information which he seeks. Unfortunately, the best and most critical investigators have long ago been forced to the conclusion that both the translations and the calendars are frequently utterly unreliable. To these snares for the student must be added another, and that is to be found in the disposition shown by many writers to ignore the work-day character of the New Netherland colonists, and to try rather to invest them with an atmosphere of quaintness and with fanciful surroundings. The ignorant fancies of such writers are often taken up as facts by their successors in the field, and propagated from one to another until it causes surprise when a question is raised as to their truth.

Mrs. Van Rensselaer is evidently quite fitted to have taken up her theme *de novo* from the original documents; such research is undoubtedly of a slow and painful nature, but the conclusions would have been her own, and she would have been relieved from anything more than a very cursory glance at many of the works upon which she seems to have relied. By failing to adopt this course in numerous instances, and relying instead upon her predecessors of various degrees of merit, she has been frequently led to incorporate in her work their inaccuracies, which she herself with a more critical examination would never have

accepted. Moreover, the author by her system of reference, in which she collects her authorities for each chapter into a large group at its end, has made it exceedingly difficult to trace the sources of these errors; and by the positive form of her statements she seems herself to assume responsibility for them.

In spite of herself, as one may say, the author occasionally falls under the influence of the grandiloquence of some of her authorities. She speaks (I. 456), at about the period of the surrender in 1664, of the "great trees and shady groves of aboriginal growth", and of the "open spaces brightened by the rich native flora, by crops of rye, barley and tobacco", etc., south of Wall Street. A closer examination of the conditions would have informed her that the entire space south of the wall, not taken up by house enclosures, only amounted to about fourteen acres, and that this space, mostly the remains of the old "Sheep Pasture", was divided among a number of owners, and in all probability remained in large measure in its original waste condition. As for the "excess of large gardens" which she speaks of in the same connection they contained only about three or four of our modern city lots of twenty-five by one hundred feet each, while "the great Dāmen Bouwerie" which she tells of (I. 458) beyond the wall contained no more than about twenty-six acres, and was but a small farm compared even with most of the others upon Manhattan. Occasionally these statements assume a ludicrous form, as when she speaks of the "*Maagde Paetje* or Maiden Lane, so called because of a brook frequented by washerwomen", extracted no doubt from some idyllic writer who failed to realize that the whole depression of Maiden Lane is only about 1200 feet in length, and could not have contained anything more than the tiniest of rills trickling through grasses and weeds. In the same manner we find (I. 190) the statement: "On Staten Island Kieft established a buckskin factory and what is said to have been the first distillery in North America." This, it is to be presumed, comes from De Vries's *Korte Historiael*, but what De Vries really says is that the director-general spoke to him, as claimant of Staten Island, on behalf of Cornelis Melyn who desired to get a few morgens of land "as he (Melyn and *not* Kieft) wanted to distil a little brandy there and to dress some buckskin".

Of more importance are many positively wrong statements which the author has culled from careless authorities. Of these, some examples are as follows: that (I. 148) Bouwery no. 1 on Manhattan Island lay south of Canal Street on the North River, whereas it is well known to most topographers to have been the farm afterward acquired by Director-General Stuyvesant, two miles away, upon the East River; that (I. 370) the people of Van der Donck's patroonship above the Harlem River escaped in the Indian devastations in 1655, whereas the records of the orphan masters of that period would have told her that several of them then lost their lives; that (I. 382) the property

of the turbulent Englishman, George Baxter, "including a farm on which Bellevue Hospital now stands", was confiscated in 1656; whereas he had sold his interest in the property referred to fourteen years before to one Nicholas Stilwell.

Outside of New Amsterdam the author has not been more fortunate in some of her statements. She tells (I. 26) of a temporary fort built about 1617 at the mouth of the Norman's Kill below Albany. This seems to have arisen from a fanciful statement of the old historian Moulton, without evidence to support it, and which is disregarded by modern historians of Albany. As to the settlement of Newtown upon Long Island she has the singular statement (I. 258) that Rev. Francis Doughty and friends "founded at Mespath the village of Newtown also called Middelburg when Dutchmen began to settle there". The objections to this statement (as will appear from Riker's *History of Newtown*, amply supported by official documentary evidence) are that the village of Newtown was not founded at Mespath, but about two miles from that locality; that Doughty had nothing to do with it, but that it was hostile to the rights which he claimed; that it was called Middelburg by the New Amsterdam authorities and not by the colonists; and that it contained no Dutchmen, the village being composed entirely of English settlers.

Some of the guesses of Mrs. Van Rensselaer's authorities are strangely at variance with known facts. She says (I. 232) that in 1644 Kieft ordered all persons who wished protection for such cattle as remained to them to join in building a good solid fence, "which stretched across the island a little above the present line of Wall Street". The original entry, however, fixes the limits of the enclosure as "from the Great Bouwery to Emanuel's plantation", which shows that it extended from what was afterwards Stuyvesant's Bouwery (at the present Ninth Street) to a small plantation of the negro called Manuel the Trumpeter. It was about two miles above Wall Street, and was a mere enclosure of some waste-land for pasturage purposes. In the same manner the author has devoted quite a paragraph (II. 69) to describing an imaginary exchange "near the bridge over the Heere Gracht or Canal" ordered by Governor Lovelace in 1670. He did indeed order stated meetings of the merchants "at or near the Bridge", but the rest is a gloss by some writer who did not understand that it was an English custom to call an open or crib-work pier a "bridge". The one here referred to is unquestionably the old Dutch pier on the line of the present Moore Street, where for nearly half a century these meetings were held, presumably in the market-house which was soon erected west of the pier. It was from this that the adjacent Whitehall Street appears in Domine Selyns's list of 1686 as "Beurs" (Exchange) Street.

Some of Mrs. Van Rensselaer's conclusions upon disputed subjects are not likely to be received unquestioningly by students of the history of New Netherland. Of these there may be mentioned her views

respecting the comparative lateness of the first habitations upon Manhattan Island, the voyage of Argall in 1613, the alleged passage of Captain Thomas Dermer through Long Island Sound and the East River in 1619, and the date of the voyage of the ship *Nieuw Nederlandt* with her Walloon settlers. In the latter case the author seems disposed to adhere firmly to what many students regard as the erroneous date of 1623. Her attempted explanation (I. 46) of the methods of the annalist Wassenaer who gives us our information of his voyage, is certainly faulty. "In part 6", says Mr. A. J. F. van Laer, the state archivist at Albany, in a letter to the reviewer upon this subject, "the preparation of the vessel is distinctly put under February, 1624, and in part 7 the date of sailing is given as March, 1624". This is amply supported by the details of the organization of the West India Company derived from other authorities, but space forbids its further discussion in this review.

As the author advances beyond the Dutch period, the sources of error become much less numerous, and this portion of her work is decidedly more satisfactory, though it may be considered perhaps that certain portions are unduly expanded; she has devoted, for example, over 200 pages of her text to the Leisler troubles alone of 1689 to 1691. With the careful revision of the first portion of her work, however, it is likely to take a very prominent place among the histories of New York.

J. H. INNES.

The Settlement of Illinois, 1778-1830. By ARTHUR CLINTON BOGGESS, Ph.D., Professor of History and Political Science in Pacific University. [Chicago Historical Society's Collections, Volume V.] (Chicago: The Society. 1908. Pp. 267.)

THE work is essentially a study of pioneer institutions, and an attempt to illustrate by means of early Illinois history the problems which confronted the state builders of a century ago. Since the methods applied by Illinois pioneers to the solution of the Indian and land questions, the problems of local government, of markets, and of transportation did not materially differ from those employed elsewhere, a study of the growth of this pioneer community may properly find a place in the literature of Western history.

The first two chapters deal with the period from 1778, when the County of Illinois was created by the Virginia legislature, to 1790, when the government under the Ordinance of 1787 was inaugurated. Owing to the restlessness of the French *habitants*, the threats of the English, the constant fear of Indian attacks, and the obstinate Spanish policy regarding the navigation of the Mississippi River, life in the Illinois country was well-nigh unbearable. Anarchy rather than government prevailed, especially after 1782 when the County of Illinois ceased to exist and the legal status of the region was in doubt.

Three chapters (III., IV., V.) are devoted to the social, economic, and governmental development before 1830. By this date many of